



University
of Glasgow

Durkan, J. and Kirk, J. (1977) *John Mair*. In: The University of Glasgow 1451-1577. University of Glasgow Press, Glasgow, pp. 155-165. ISBN 9780852611371

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/4809/>

Deposited on: 23 January 2009

9. John Mair

'Maister Johnne Mair, whose wound then was holden as an oracle.'

John Knox, *History*

'Has not Amerigo Vespucci in our day discovered lands unknown to Ptolemy, Pliny and other geographers up to the present? Why can this not happen in other spheres?'

In Quartum Sententiarum

THE NEXT principal, John Mair (or Major, as he is usually called) was one of the great Scotsmen of the sixteenth century. Almost the last of the old breed of scholastics, he was not always acceptable to many of the new breed. Others continued to cite him with respect, especially the Spaniards, when the whirligig of time brought scholasticism its second wind in the university curricula of the seventeenth century. His garrulousness, his 'wagon-loads of trifling', were criticised by men of the Renaissance and the Reformation, and these criticisms have been echoed in more modern times. In one respect they were fortunate for occasionally Mair goes off at a tangent to tell us something pertinent about himself or the Scotland of his day which shows a sharp eye and an alert mind. More recently he has regained respectful attention from scholars of diverse allegiances,¹ and his work is worth treating at some length as a specimen of the best teaching available to Scots students in the pre-Reformation era.

About his life, information is abundant and only salient points can be noticed here.²

He was born in 1467 (not, as Burns shows, 1469) at Gleghornie, near Haddington, and was destined for the priesthood, but the harsh discipline of his Haddington schoolmaster, George Lister, almost put him off: 'he was harder than was just in beating boys'.³ The first certain fact about his higher education is that he entered the college of Godshouse (later Christ's College) in Cambridge about 1491-2. There he seems to have remained for a year. Godshouse was a college for the training of grammar masters the head of which was a certain John Syclyng. But Mair's own master was apparently John Thorn, 'the ornament of Cambridge university'. From England he crossed over to Paris, studying first under Jean Bouillache at the college of Ste Barbe; his teacher later became regent of grammar in the college of Navarre.

He then began to study theology under Jean Standonck, the principal of the college of Montaigu of whom Mair never spoke without awe, boasting of having lived 'in the shadow of so great a man'.⁴ Inspired by a school of able logicians, including Jeronimo Pardo, a Spaniard, Mair was a prominent teacher almost from the first.⁵ His lectures, beginning in 1499 with the *Exponibilia*—the very title showing his nominalist affiliations—were eagerly sought after by the Paris printers. This began an incessant work of publication and editing which went on for thirty more years. At Montaigu he taught both arts and theology after taking his doctorate in 1506.⁶ His commentaries on the Sentences were considered to be the liveliest, profoundest and most up-to-date. In 1518, when he received his invitation to Glasgow, he had published at Paris at least forty-six separate editions in philosophy and theology.⁷ He was then a middle-aged man in his fifties, small in stature, 'major only in name', the author's joke to which George Buchanan gave an acrimonious twist. Within a month he issued his commentary on St Matthew's gospel from 'the academy of Glasgow',⁸ to which he hoped to bring the ideals of the Academy of Athens. He had been a student under the restorer of Greek at Paris, the elder Girolamo Aleandro, who in 1512 entered in his diary: 'Many scholars are to be found in France who are keen students in different fields of knowledge, and several of these were among my faithful hearers, such as John Mair, doctor of theology, and David Cranston, shortly to take his doctorate, distinguished friends of mine . . .'.⁹

The dedication prefaced to Mair's edition of the gospel of Matthew is composed in the fulsome style of contemporary epistolary models and reflects his admiration of its addressee, Archbishop Beaton.¹⁰ But the letter also preaches to him a little of his duties in intellectual matters, in the manner of David Cranston's earlier letter to Blackadder. Those who are high priests, says Mair, ought to guard the sacred books as the ancient Egyptians did theirs, all the more as they are the archetypes and models that other mortals must follow. Not for nothing did the world's Archetype lay down that the divine mysteries be handled only by those who already loved wisdom: the Jewish seers and Essenes were as devoted to it as to their priestly calling. But Beaton had already all the Pauline virtues, and if he had his responsibilities as a leader, Mair has his as a son, of the Church. 'Epaminondas seeing an army leaderless said, "I see a headless monster"'. Likewise this our little edition would go on to the stage lacking the dress for the part and headless, without your patronage and blessing.¹¹

It looks as though Iamblichus and Marsilio Ficino have influenced his thought and style here and we know he was amicably disposed to the elder Giovanni Pico della Mirandola.¹² It is often stated that in

1508 Mair preached at Paul's Cross in London for John Colet, an English disciple of Ficino.¹³ But this was surely 'the Scottyshe doctor and ffrere of Grenewych', the Observant Franciscan, Friar Donald Gibson (Gilberti), who was guardian of the royal foundation at Greenwich,¹⁴ the same whom Sir Thomas More heard in his youth, attacking the abuses attached to pilgrimages to Marian shrines.¹⁵

Mair's benign references to Pico are concerned largely with his attempts to reconcile Plato and Aristotle and to the famous letter (which Mair republished) from Pico to Ermolao Barbaro defending the 'barbaric' jargon of university philosophy against its traducers such as Lorenzo Valla, on whose attempts to marry logic and rhetoric Mair pours obsessive scorn, most notably in citing his pupil, David Cranston, in dialogue with a Scots admirer of Valla, the poet, Gavin Douglas.¹⁶ Philosophers deliberately cultivated a pithy, non-rhetorical language.

The views of Mair in youth and in middle age on conciliar government in the Church were familiar in his day and carried on a Scottish tradition of conciliar thinking that had obvious antecedents in the period of the Councils of Constance and Basle, and subsequently in John Ireland and others. The defence of papal authority had been renewed by Thomas de Vio, a Dominican, later Cardinal Cajetan, against the French King's politically motivated summoning of the Council of Pisa. One of Mair's pupils, the Frenchman Jacques Almain, replied as did Mair himself, in more sober terms, in his commentary on St Matthew's gospel, based on earlier lectures. Using Nicholas of Lyra's text of the Bible and discussing Matthew, 16, 13-19 (the giving of the power of the keys to Peter), Mair emphasises the community aspect of the event, the desire of Jesus to win from the disciples a united confession of faith; the fact that, though Peter had a special position, he replied in the name of them all; that the rock on which the Church rested was its one foundation, Christ. The Church, for the younger Mair, was in the first instance, the 'congregation of the faithful' and elsewhere he resists humanist attempts to redefine it in pagan terms.¹⁷ He went on to deny to the pope, as successor of Peter, the temporal power, then proceeded to emphasise his ministerial rôle and indicated, while accepting the term 'Vicar of Christ' for the pope, that this did not rule out the fact that there was an enormous distance between Christ and his vicar, as vicars did not generally have the same powers as those they represented. Though accepting the deposing power of the papacy, he turned it into a deposing power for subjects, as the pope's rôle would be purely one of persuasion. He defended the so-called Donation of Constantine to the papacy, attacked as a forgery by Lorenzo Valla and by others before him, but drew no political

conclusions from it and re-emphasised the ambiguity involved in ecclesiastical wealth.¹⁸ Likewise in his commentary on Matthew 18, 15–18, he made it the occasion for a complaint about facile excommunication procedures, explored further the relationship of the general body of Christians—especially when gathered in council—to an erring or heretical pope, conditionally accepting the proverbial phrase ‘Nobody judges the pope (the first see)’ only if conjoined with ‘so long as he wishes to act justly’ (as in the original). Mair, the proclaimed enemy of the primacy of canon law, nevertheless makes great use of canonistic authorities and his easy progress from theories of ecclesiastical to theories of secular government gives added force to the thesis of those who see in him a key influence on subsequent Scottish political theory. An unhappy illustration of his theory about the deposition of unworthy rulers was his view that Indian kings in America tolerating the cult of idols could be deposed—but by the Spanish invaders. Las Casas opposed this view on the grounds that Mair had no personal experience of Indians.¹⁹

Some attention has been given in recent years to Mair as an authority on international law, on which he wrote as a theologian at the peak of the first Iberian adventures in the New World. He treated questions regarding the occupation of new found lands, the property rights of the human race in land, air and water, the questions of just and unjust wars (wars of expansion, reprisals, alliances with non-Christians). He certainly influenced to a great extent future Spanish theorists on problems of international law.²⁰

On ethical questions, Mair lectured in Glasgow ‘from beginning to end’ (*ab ouo ad malum*): these lectures must have laid the groundwork of the sole printed edition.²¹ Mention has already been made of the fact that some medieval teachers were unhappy about retailing pagan ethics to Christian youth: at St Leonard’s College, St Andrews, there was the option of ‘one of the books of Solomon’ instead.²² Mair, on the contrary, had no scruples, as he wrote in his introduction to Cardinal Thomas Wolsey: Aristotle’s attitude to the contemplative and active life is, he maintained, the same as that of the Bible when it treats of Rachel and Leah and Martha and Mary.²³ Aristotle condemns suicide, affirms free will, praises the heroic virtues and magnanimity—summing up the virtues, one might add, of a gentleman—all things which made the *Ethics* a popular vademecum for the intelligent of the period. Mair hesitates to speak of ethical knowledge: ethics is practice rather than theory.²⁴ His work uses the new Latin translation of Johannes Argyropoulos and also refers to the alternative version of Leonardo Bruni. The Latin of Mair’s commentary is more elevated than is usual with him, and when he cites Theognis and Phocylides he

no doubt does so from the edition of his Paris master, Girolamo Aleandro.²⁵

More specialised aspects of moral problems are those relating to marriage. In defending pleasure in the married state, Mair, while sharing traditional prejudices, shows his usual matter-of-factness and sympathy for ordinary folk. He widens the idea of the moralists, who thought of marriage as primarily a moral remedy for concupiscence, to make it a physical one. According to one commentator, his approach shows a perceptible trend away from stressing relational and personal to individual motivation, which trend he puts down to Mair's nominalist and Scotist upbringing.²⁶ Cajetan made some use of Mair's work here.²⁷

Probably the younger Mair was most renowned, and in his latter years, most condemned, as a scholastic logician. In view of the late sixteenth-century regeneration of Spanish philosophy, it is worth pointing to Mair's place in the chain of influences that brought it about. Lately some studies have brought to light fresh aspects of that influence. Cristobal de Medina at Salamanca university referred to Mair's work in his teaching. Juan Martinez Silicea, in his *Ars Arithmetica* (Paris, 1514) praised rather another Scot, Robert Galbraith. Domingo de San Juan declared in 1522 that at Salamanca 'in this flourishing university it was solemnly decreed, and that to no little common advantage and utility of the students, that the nominalist regents in arts should be compelled in the first year of their course to lecture on the Dialectic of the revered master John Mair, a man celebrated the world over'. At Alcalá, likewise, Mair was popular. Sancho Carranza de Miranda cites him. Antonio Ramirez de Villaescusa was an associate of his pupil, David Cranston. Fernando de Enzinas was of the school of Mair and his treatise on the properties of the mental proposition was edited by a Scot, Robert Wauchope. In Spain, Mair with his school, while perhaps not the 'oracle' that John Knox claimed he was in Scotland, was nevertheless often quoted from the pulpit.²⁸

The most important recent study of Mair's logic and philosophy is by T. F. Torrance, a study whose content is too technical and too densely argued to be appositely summarised in a brief paragraph. The writer is critical of the medieval 'terminist' school, as it is sometimes called, with its 'arid linguistic nominalism'. He exempts Mair from his strictures, however, emphasising his combination of severe logical analysis with a close grip on everyday experience. He stresses rather Mair's debt to his fellow countrymen, Duns Scotus and Richard of St Victor, and his rôle as a bridge between medieval and modern thought, with a possible influence on his Paris student, Calvin. Through all

intermediate representation, Mair's thought, Torrance maintains, reaches out to objective realities, and for him intuitive perception is important in natural and theological science—though Mair has reservations about theology precisely as scientific. He breaks away from an exclusively visual approach to learning and emphasises affective and auditory paths to knowledge, yet according to Torrance, he suffers in theology from being untouched by the works of Jacques Lefèvre and the 'modern devotion', and from using an inadequate notion of 'authentic transmission' in tradition, though he is critical of the view that authority can replace faith.²⁹

Mair's mathematical interests have had less investigation. In his treatise on the infinite, the subject is envisaged largely from a logical standpoint. As has been said, it is astonishing how men carrying so little mathematical baggage managed to get as far as they did. Towards the end of his career, he found students impatient of these hypothetical discussions (hypothetical, to escape the post-1277 censures of anything disturbing the accepted theological picture of the physical world) and duly abbreviated his infinitist references. Later, on a more favourable mathematical basis, the infinitist theme would re-emerge, to dominate the horizon of the seventeenth-century inventors.³⁰

Some of his objections to a thesis whether 'local motion is a successive entity distinct from anything permanent' are again theological difficulties, which he proceeds to resolve in a way that make it difficult, one commentator suggests, to identify his own position as nominalist or realist.³¹ There seems rather to be a rapprochement between the schools, for he discussed the problems in kinematics which were customarily a nominalist concern, and problems in dynamics such as the importance of cause in the velocity of local motion in realist terms. He deserves a place in the line of those who applied concepts of the infinitesimal to problems of motion and passed on the discussions of impetus raised by Buridan in Paris and by the Oxford Merton school, especially Heytesbury and Swineshead, through to Domingo de Soto and Francisco Toledo whom Galileo certainly read, though whether these influences have any central importance for his founding of a new science of mechanics is controverted.³² In any event, medieval science was no mere rehearsal of Aristotle: some of it grew up in a basic independence of him even, as a disturbing and inharmonious annexed body of knowledge. Yet the extraordinary persistence—in spite of attacks upon it—of Aristotle's physics was due to its logical consistency which it was and continued to be intellectually convenient to maintain.

Mair taught the *Physics* in Glasgow and referred to the earth tremors there and in Paisley.³³ He also read the *Sentences* in Glasgow and

mentions how it was customary for professors of theology (*theosophiae*) also to teach the liberal arts in Scotland.³⁴ From his commentaries on the *Sentences*, some evidence has been elicited on his views on social and economic questions: the precarious system of land-tenure which encouraged neglect and mismanagement; the military propensities of the farming community; inadequate rural housing; the advantages of feu-farm; relative money values in Scotland and elsewhere.³⁵ He was also, as a pioneering article has shown, interested in the moral problem raised by the growth of the international money-market³⁶: he firmly maintained the medieval prohibition on receiving profit on a money loan, while scrutinising any extrinsic factors which would compensate the lenders. Since then it has been shown that he discussed other contemporary economic problems: 'in spite of his respect for tradition, he is less bookish than might be thought and pauses sometimes to make just remarks and cite well-chosen examples to relieve his prose, elsewhere monotonous and off-putting'.³⁷ Not a very promising introduction, but as the writer proceeds he becomes more enthusiastic: the scholastics did not believe in anything beyond monastic communism and had not the resources for a planned economy nor any wide programme of social change. This modern economist points out that Mair defends money exchange as against barter, for even the most arid places—Iceland—contribute to international trade. The nominalists tended to wish the establishment by authority of a fixed just price: for Mair this is the legal or market price. Mair also denounces monopolies and is hostile to corporations. He defends letters of change and disagrees with merchants who devote themselves exclusively to the speculative market. He deals benignly with problems of international borrowing, accepts maritime insurance and, more surprisingly, 'opportunity cost', arising from lost opportunities on the market, as a valid title: the latter point is a real contribution to the development of economic theory. The 'triple contract', a technique for avoiding the accusation of usury, defended by Mair, was a forerunner of modern theory though it later became the subject of a papal condemnation. His economic theory had a logical coherence, and he was a link in the chain that led to Adam Smith.

He is best known as an historian.³⁸ He inherited from his sources many inaccuracies, but in their deployment he was neither gullible nor prejudiced. He tried to get beyond the chronicle form and set out to look for historical patterns where possible. He is an enthusiastic Scotsman, defending the country's desire for independence, yet anxious to avoid too separatist an attitude to Scotland's neighbours. He considered that nobles were Scotland's natural leaders and yet had no illusions about their faults: churchmen too were not spared his honest

criticism. Unlike his immediate successors, he wanted no truck with ancient fables about Brutus and Gathelus and the origins of the nation. He uses the phrase 'Greater Britain' which has been shown to have a longer pedigree than writers have often imagined.³⁹ His dedication to King James V is totally free of flattery and he made plain that he had no intention of merely setting down the record like a chronicle but would proceed to make historical judgments as well; but this he did with a modest and sober attention to the factual evidence.

Specialism has grown apace and it is not possible for anybody now to cover the range of interests exhibited by Mair in the sixteenth century. In spite of his vast learning and genial approach, he was not equal to the mental convulsions that shook Europe in his later years. Many who wrote about him do not allow sufficiently for a change and hardening of attitude as he aged. We do not really have the answer to the apparent contradictions; the signs of some sympathy with the Renaissance revival of studies, and, at the same time, the rigid conservatism in his discussion of the links between logic and rhetoric. Basically he seems to have sensed that if theologians gave up philosophy to become orators they would surrender philosophy to men of a purely secular frame of mind, which Mair as a man of deep Christian faith, was not prepared to do. In his later *Gospel Commentaries* (1529), as Ganoczy has shown, he omitted and played down conciliar themes and avoided the issue of ecclesiastical structures, but was horrified by what he saw as the renewed 'Wycliffite' attack on papal authority. In these circumstances, one must ask which of these two men, the younger or the older theologian, affected more the religious and political formation of his Roman Catholic successors as well as of John Knox, Pierre Viret, George Buchanan and John Calvin.⁴⁰

In any event, his ideas were influential. At the time, Glasgow was fortunate to get a man of international calibre to teach in its as yet humble schools of theology and arts; and later it will be possible to show from the record number of enrolments that his teaching was fully appreciated.

NOTES

1. For some of the criticism and counter-criticism, see J. Durkan, 'John Major: After 400 Years', *IR*, i, 131-57 (bibliography).
2. The sources for his life are John Major, *A History of Greater Britain*, translated by Archibald Constable, with author's life by Aeneas J. G. Mackay (SHS, Edinburgh, 1892); J. H. Burns, 'New Light on John Major', *IR*, v, 83-100, and also his note in *SHR*, xxxi, 98; note by A. L. Gabriel and G. C. Boyce, *Auctarium*, vi, 733-4; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963), 384-5.

3. Lister was a St Andrews graduate, *AFA*, 196.
4. Major, *History*, 430. 'Magni enim estimaui et estimo sub umbra talis et tanti viri quiescere.'
5. Hubert Elie, 'Quelques Maîtres de l'université de Paris vers l'an 1500', *Archives d'Hist. Doctrinale et Litt. du Moyen Age*, xviii (1951), 193–243, esp. 205ff.
6. Clerval, *Registre des Procès Verbaux*, i, 5, 20.
7. Durkan, *art. cit.*, *IR*, i, 140, gives the bibliography.
8. Burns, 'New Light', *IR*, v, 90, says this dedication was dated on 22 December. It was '10 Cal. Decembris', however; i.e., 22 November (Major, *History*, 436). The book was printed in Paris.
9. Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris pendant les Premières Guerres d'Italie (1494-1517)*, second edition (Paris, 1953), 614. But Mair was involved in the strife of the universities with Reuchlin, the Hebrew scholar and devotee of the Cabala.
10. The Archbishop, who was presented to the temporality of Kilwinning in 1516, *RSS*, i, 2725, in turn must have arranged for Mair to be vicar of Dunlop, a kirk annexed to Kilwinning.
11. Major, *History*, 435–6, reprinted from his commentary on Matthew. His Greek studies are reflected in the use of 'prothomiste' for 'high priests' and 'acephala' for 'headless'.
12. Major, *History*, 420, and there are other references to Pico gathered throughout his works. Nicholas of Cusa likewise uses language similar to Mair's in this letter.
13. J. H. Lupton, *A Life of John Colet, D.D.* (London, 1887), 49.
14. Bishop Richard Fox also patronised this foundation, to which other Scots (as well as Flemings and Germans) were probably attached (because their Observant reform preceded the English one), A. G. Little, 'Introduction of the Observant Friars into England', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, x (1924), 455–71, and *ibid.*, xxvii (1941), 159 note. (Among other names is one later associated with the Scottish Observant province, Louis Williamson.)
15. W. E. Campbell and A. W. Reed, *More's English Works*, ii, 62, in 'A Dialogue concernynge heresyes'.
16. Major, *History*, 427–8.
17. *Ibid.*, 342–3.
18. Alexandre Ganoczy, 'Jean Major, exégète gallican', *Recherches de Science religieuse*, lvi (Paris, 1968), 457–95. Matthew Spinka, *Advocates of Reform* (1953), 175–84, reprints the text in English. J. H. Burns, 'The Conciliar Tradition in Scotland', *SHR*, xlii (1963), 89–104. Francis Oakley, 'Almain and Major: Conciliar Theory on the Eve of the Reformation', *American Historical Review*, lxx (1965), 673–90. Francis Oakley, 'From Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', *Journal of British Studies*, i (1962), 12–19. For a curialist of Bishop Turnbull's time whose papalism was more moderate than Cajetan's, cf. J. A. F. Thomson, 'Papalism and Conciliarism in Antonio Roselli's "Monarchia"', *Mediaeval Studies*, xxxvii (Toronto, 1975), 445–58.
19. *Bartolomé de las Casas in History*, ed. Juan Friede and Benjamin Keene (De Kalb, Illinois, 1971), 303.
20. V. E. Hrabar, 'Le droit politique et le droit international dans les Questions de Jean Mair sur les Sentences de Pierre Lombard', *Académie des Sciences Oukrainienne* (Kiev, 1927), 22–35, preceded by Russian text. Chapter VI, 'El Jefe de Monteagudo: Jean Mair', of Ricardo G. Villoslada, *La Universidad de Paris durante los Estudios de Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1507-1522)*, *Analecta Gregoriana XIV, Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae Sectio B* (2) (Rome,

- 1938), 127–64. V. D. Carro, *La Teología y los Teólogos—Juristas Españoles ante la Conquista de América*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1944), ad indices.
21. J. H. Burns, 'New Light', *IR*, v (1954), 99–100, prints the letter (omitted in the appendix to the *History*) of Mair to William Gibson and John Spreull of Glasgow which mentions this fact. The Mair *Ethica Aristotelis* appeared at Paris in 1530.
 22. Herkless and Hannay, *The College of St. Leonard*, 148.
 23. Major, *History*, 449.
 24. R. A. Gauthier and J. Y. Jolif, *L'Ethique à Nicomaque* (Louvain/Paris, 1970), i (1), 164.
 25. G. Alejandro, *Gnomologia* (Paris, 1512), includes the Greek elegies and epigrams of both.
 26. This seems an oversimplification, and based mainly on the 1521 *In Quantum Sententiarum*. L. Vereecke, 'Jean Mair: Un acte permis mais scabreux', *Mariage et Sexualité au declin du Moyen Age*, Supplément de *La Vie Spirituelle* xiv (Paris, 1961). The notion of pleasure referred to is dealt with at some length in the *Ethica Aristotelis* (1530), not used by Vereecke. I have not seen S. Concha Rodriguez 'La teología del matrimonio en Joannes Maior, El propósito del acto matrimonial' *Anales de la Facultad de Teología, Santiago, Chile*, xxii (1971), 7–13.
 27. Dennis Doherty, *The Sexual Doctrine of Cardinal Cajetan* (Regensburg, 1966), 32, 223, 254, 281, suggests that Mair accepted adultery as a reason for divorce and believed that procreation was not the sole aim of marriage.
 28. Vicente Munoz Delgado, 'La Logica en Salamanca durante la Primera Mitad del Siglo XVI', *Salmanticensis*, xiv (1967), 171–207; *ibid.*, 'La Logica en la Universidad de Alcalá durante la primera Mitad del Siglo XVI', *Salmanticensis*, xv (1968), 161–218. Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* (Paris, 1937), 729. For a fuller discussion of the background of Spanish philosophy of the early Renaissance see the above writer's many other contributions to the subject (often incidentally mentioning Mair) in *La Ciudad de Dios* and elsewhere.
 29. Thomas F. Torrance, 'La Philosophie et la Théologie de Jean Mair ou Major', *Archives de la Philosophie* (Paris, 1969–70), xxxii, 531–47; xxxiii, 261–93. Hubert Elie, *Le Complexe Significable* (Paris, 1937) discusses Mair's logic from a more strictly historical angle.
 30. Hubert Elie, *Le Traité 'De l'Infini' de Jean Mair* (Paris, 1938), new edition with apparatus and French translation, and a useful note (220–40) on the criticisms of Mair's disciple, Luis Coronel.
 31. William A. Wallace, *Causality and Scientific Explanation* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1972), 131–2.
 32. *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, ix (New York, 1974), s.v. Maior (32–3). W. A. Wallace, "'The Calculatores'" in *Early Sixteenth Century Physics*, *British Journal for the History of Science*, iv (1969), 221–32. *Ibid.*, 'The Enigma of Domingo de Soto', *Isis* (Berkeley, Calif., 1968), 384–401.
 33. Burns, 'New Light', *IR*, v, 91.
 34. Major, *History*, 439 (letter to Peter Chaplain).
 35. As well as much folk-lore. Cf. J. H. Burns, 'The Scotland of John Major', *IR*, ii (1951), 65–76.
 36. Louis Vereecke, 'La licéité du *cambium bursae* chez Jean Mair', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, ser. 4, xxx (1952), 124–38.
 37. Raymond de Roover, 'La Pensée Economique de Jean Mair', *Journal des Savants*, cix (1970), 65–81. The earlier part is biographical and both it and the bibliography require some updating.
 38. R. G. Cant, 'John Major', *Veterum Laudes*, St Andrews University Publications

xlvi (Edinburgh, 1950), 21–31, is still the best account of this facet of Mair's scholarship.

39. Denys Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, revised edition (Edinburgh, 1968), 128–44.
40. Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta, Ga., 1974), discusses Mair (144–6) as one of many converging factors influencing Calvin, at the same time firmly stressing the originality of Calvin's mind. For his influence on Viret, cf. R. D. Linder, *The Political Ideas of Pierre Viret* (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, no. 64, Geneva, 1964), 20 and note.